



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,348	05/18/2005	Franz Amtmann	AT02 0068 US	7144

65913 7590 05/23/2008  
NXP, B.V.  
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
M/S41-SJ  
1109 MCKAY DRIVE  
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER
----------

BROWN, VERNAL U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

05/23/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/535,348	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AMTMANN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> VERNAL U. BROWN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to communication filed on 2/19/2008.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 2/19/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the references of Cesar and Meier fail to teach or suggests the check data block is evaluated for the recognition of whether the transponder belongs to a group of transponders. It is the examiner's position that the reference of Meier teaches Meier teaches the check block is generated based on the particular CCIT algorithm used (page 6 lines 7-16). The check byte therefore identifies a group of transponder base on the algorithm used for generating the data check block.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cesar et al. 5673037 in view of Meier European Paten Application EP 0805575.

Regarding claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10, Cesar et al. teaches a method of recognizing whether a transponder belong to one of at least two groups of transponders by transmitting a command signal to the transponder and the command signal is evaluated in the transponder to determine whether or not the transponder belong to a particular group of transponders (col. 2 lines 47-55, col. 3 lines 32-56). Cesar et al. is silent on teaching the request signal transmitted to the transponder includes a check data block. Meier in an analogous art teaches the message structure transmitted from an interrogator to the transponders include a check block for performing error correction (page 4 lines 20-35). Meier teaches the check block is generated based on the particular CCIT algorithm used (page 6 lines 7-16). The check byte therefore identifies a group of transponder base on the algorithm used for generating the data check block.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the request signal transmitted to the transponder to include a check data block in Cesar et al. because this enables the transponder to detect and correct transmission errors and enables effective communication between the interrogator and transponder.

Regarding claim 2, Cesar et al. teaches transmitting data between an interrogator and transponder (see response to claim 1) but is silent on teaching appending a CRC check data block to the data. Meier in an analogous art teaches the use of CRC data block for detecting and correcting errors in data transmitted between an interrogator and transponder (page 2 lines 34-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Cesar et al. as disclosed by Meier because CRC data block provides a low cost and effective means of increasing data security by detecting transmission errors.

Regarding claim 4, Cesar et al. teaches transmitting data between an interrogator and transponder (see response to claim 1) but is silent on teaching a CRC generation data block means Meier in an analogous art teaches a transponder comprising a CRC data block generation means provided by linear feedback shift registers and teaches the CRC data block is based on the predetermined CRC algorithm and the initial state of the data flip flop which forms the start value (page 4 lines 20-35). Meier teaches preprogramming the shift registers with a start value memory means provided by the cipher key EEPROM (58) and the start value memory is programmable by the interrogator with different start values (page 4 lines 36-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Cesar et al. as disclosed by Meier because the programming of CRC generator start value provides for the creation of a unique signature error detection system and further increases the data security of the system.

Regarding claims 6 and 8-9, Cesar et al. teaches transmitting data between an interrogator and transponder (see response to claim 1) but is silent on teaching a CRC generation data block means Meier in an analogous art teaches a transponder comprising a CRC data block generation means provided by linear feedback shift registers and teaches the CRC data block is based on the predetermined CRC algorithm and the initial state of the data flip flop which forms the start value (page 4 lines 20-35). Meier teaches preprogramming the shift registers with a start value

Art Unit: 2612

memory means provided by the cipher key EEPROM (58) and the start value memory is programmable by the interrogator with different start values (page 4 lines 36-50). Meier teaches the check data block generation means is provided by the CRC generator and the CRC checking is carried out by shifting the received data through the shift registers (page 6 lines 25-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Cesar et al. as disclosed by Meier because the programming of CRC generator start value provides for the creation of a unique signature error detection system and further increases the data security of the system.

Regarding claim 11-12, Cesar et al. teaches transmitting data between an interrogator and transponder (see response to claim 1) but is silent on teaching a CRC generation data block means Meier in an analogous art teaches a transponder comprising a CRC data block generation means provided by linear feedback shift registers and teaches the CRC data block is based on the predetermined CRC algorithm and the initial state of the data flip flop which forms the start value (page 4 lines 20-35). Meier teaches preprogramming the shift registers with a start value memory means provided by the cipher key EEPROM (58) and the start value memory is programmable by the interrogator with different start values (page 4 lines 36-50). Meier teaches the check data block generation means is provided by the CRC generator and the CRC checking is carried out by shifting the received data through the shift registers (page 6 lines 25-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Cesar et al. as disclosed by Meier because the programming of CRC generator start value provides for the creation of a unique signature error detection system and further increases the data security of the system.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VERNAL U. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-7:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-3059. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vernal U Brown/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2612

/Brian A Zimmerman/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2612